

Package Document

Related Packages: [26030 \(Scoping - Approved 09/10/18\)](#)

Funding

Federal Funding? Yes

Federal Oversight? Yes

[Federal Oversight Agreement \(June 2015\)](#)

Type

Is this project being documented as an emergency project? Yes No

Phase: Evaluation

Classification: Categorical Exclusion (Class II)

CE Level: 1b

CE Action: 04 05 06 07 08 09
 10 11 12 13 14 Other

[List](#)

Projects

PDOT Project Manager: Jason E Layman

Federal Project Number: N/A

MPMS Projects

Lead?	Status/Title	District/County	SR/Sec	Description
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 90021	Active / I-80 Canoe Creek Bridges	10 / Clarion	0080 / 365	I-80 (eastbound and westbound) over SR 4005 (Tippecanoe Road) and Canoe Creek; Beaver Township; Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement

*The last time MPMS data was added or refreshed was on Friday, 17 April 2020 08:14 AM.

Project Funding & Fiscal Constraint

MPMS	FD \$	ROW \$	UTL \$	CON \$	TIP	L RTP Date
90021	2,121,800	265,226	265,226		FFY 2019 Interstate TIP	

Remarks: Project is anticipated to draw approximately \$95,000,000 in construction funding.

For federally funded projects where the construction phase (and if needed, ROW and/or utilities phases) is not programmed on the current TIP, remarks provide a detailed reference to the current LRTP identifying full funding for the project.

"LRTP Date" is the date of the last adopted Long Range Transportation Plan.

Refer to Supplement to January 28, 2008 "Transportation Planning Requirements and Their Relationship to NEPA Process Completion"

Editors

Names & Groups: Bryan K Vogelsang/PennDOT BP-000243
 Daniel R Giles P.E./PennDOT BP-000028
 David A Cutlip/PennDOT BP-000243
 Deborah Henson/PennDOT BP-000028
 Domenic Sacchetti/PennDOT BP-000028
 Jared M Govi/PennDOT BP-000243
 Jason Bono/PennDOT BP-000028
 Jason D Harkcom/PennDOT BP-000243
 Jason E Layman/PennDOT
 Jessica L Rizzilli/PennDOT
 John L McCombie/PennDOT
 Josh B Kisling/PennDOT BP-000028
 Kathy Krommes/PennDOT BP-000028
 Matthew J Mucha/PennDOT
 Robert Schmidt/PennDOT BP-000028
 Ryan A Rowles/PennDOT BP-000243
 All District 10 Users

Reviewers

System User Names

Non-System / Other Addresses

Notify These Additional Emails Upon Approval:

Package was submitted on Friday, 17 April 2020 08:30 AM by Jessica L Rizzilli/PennDOT

Email Notify	Reviewed By	Date/Time
EM: Jessica L Rizzilli/PennDOT	Jessica L Rizzilli/PennDOT	Fri, 04/17/20 08:30 AM
ADE: Tim J Jablunovsky/PennDOT	Tim J Jablunovsky/PennDOT	Mon, 04/20/20 07:12 AM
DE: Brian N Allen/PennDOT	Brian N Allen/PennDOT	Mon, 04/20/20 07:22 AM

CEES Package Number: 28130

Categorical Exclusion Evaluation

MPMS: 90021

Project: I-80 Canoe Creek Bridges



SR/Section: 0080 / 365

County: Clarion

District: 10

CE Level: 1b

CE Action: 13

Created: 09/10/18 by Jessica L Rizzilli

Submitted: 04/17/20 by Jessica L Rizzilli

Approved: 04/20/20 by Brian N Allen

CE Evaluation Part A
General Project Identification & Description

Project Identification

Part A Prepared By: Bob Schmidt
HDR

Originating Office: District 10-0

Date: 04/17/20

Federal Project Number: N/A

Township/Municipality: Beaver Township

Local Name: I-80 Canoe Creek Bridges

Limits of Work (Segment/Offset)

Construction Stations

Start:	End:	Start:	End:
0534/2167	0564/1975	221+00 EB	346+50 EB
0541/2517	0561/1732	220+00 WB	337+00 WB

Total Length: 12,350 ft

Program: 321 **Funding:** **federal** 80 **state** 20 **local** 0 **other** 0

Date of First Federal Authorization for Preliminary Engineering: 12/28/2016

Date of Federal Authorization Time Extension(s) for Preliminary Engineering (if applicable): N/A

Project Description

Include narrative to describe the general project scope of work.

Attach Location Map(s) and Design Plan (only overview and sheets showing limits of work).

The project will consist of the replacement of the I-80 Canoe Creek Bridges EB & WB (SR 0080 Section 365) in Beaver Township, Clarion County over SR 4005 (Tippecanoe Rd) and Canoe Creek. During the replacement of the bridges, two lanes of traffic Eastbound and Westbound must be maintained at all times. The anticipated limits of project is approximately three miles along Interstate 80 bound between the Knox interchange and the weigh stations (MM 53.5 to MM 56.5) featuring the two parallel structures (~1,160' each) that carry the interstate over SR 4005 (Tippecanoe Road) and Canoe Creek .

Project Purpose and Need

Include narrative to describe the project need.

Purpose: The purpose of the project is to provide a safe crossing of I-80 over SR 4005 (Tippecanoe Road) and Canoe Creek. The objective is to replace the existing structures and update the roadway within project limits to meet current design criteria with respect to speed limit and geometry while simultaneously improving safety along the corridor.

Need(s): The Eastbound (EB) and Westbound (WB) Canoe Creek bridges were originally constructed in 1966. In 1985, additional spans were added to each end of the bridges. The bridges are functionally obsolete due to their curb-to-curb width and are considered fracture critical based on the original Girder-Floorbeam-Stringer (GFS) superstructure limits. Both structures possess problematic fatigue details which have received multiple retrofits during the service lives of the structures. Recent BMS2 inspection data indicates the EB bridge to be in fair condition with a sufficiency rating of 83.9 and is on a 12-month inspection frequency schedule. The WB bridge is listed as poor condition with a sufficiency rating of 55 and on a 6-month inspection frequency schedule. The existing structure type, fatigue details and frequency of inspection further underline the urgency to replace this asset.

Project Setting and Distinct Project Features

Provide narrative to adequately describe the project setting (terrain, locale, land use, presence of bicycle/pedestrian or other unique facilities, etc.) and support the evaluation. Any additional information not otherwise covered by this form that is necessary to clearly understand project circumstances should also be included in this section. Narrative should be appropriate for the complexity of the CEE and project circumstances with the length and content varying accordingly.

The general site topography is forested rural woodlands with rolling hills. The bridge structures are located along a horizontal tangent bound by reverse horizontal curves. The western curvature is substandard by current design criteria. The eastbound and westbound alignments are vertically bifurcated with elevation differences in excess of 20 feet and exhibit varying vertical curvatures and grades. The variable geometry presents significant design challenges with respect to balancing cuts and fills and resolution of the proposed geometry within design criteria for both final design and maintenance of traffic. The Tippecanoe Furnace is a documented cultural resource located along the northwest corner of the westbound structure. The design approach will prioritize avoidance as the primary means of minimizing impacts to the resource. In addition, Canoe Creek has a High-Quality, Cold Water Fishery designation and is listed as both stocked and wild trout waters.

Describe the involvement with utilities with this project.

Minor involvement with utilities, public and private, is anticipated in the immediate vicinity of the bridge structures and the proximity of SR 4005 beneath the I-80 structure.

Describe the involvement with any railroad (active or inactive) including all rail lines, crossings, bridges, or signals.

None

Describe changes to access control.

None

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

1. [General_Location.pdf](#) (112KB / 0.1MB)
2. [Construction_Plan_Base_Roll_Plot_2019-12-24.pdf](#) (4334KB / 4.2MB)

CE Evaluation Part A
Engineering Information

Design Criteria

Roadway Description: SR 0080

Functional Classification: Freeways/Interstates

Urban Rural

Current ADT: 26745

Design Year No-Build / Build ADT, as well as Current / Design Year Build LOS, is only necessary when PM2.5 hot spot analysis is required.

If PM2.5 hot spot analysis is not needed (see exempt project list in Air Quality Handbook, Pub #321), "N/A" can be entered for these values.

Design Year No-Build ADT: N/A

Current LOS: N/A

Design Year Build ADT: 44754

Design Year Build LOS: N/A

DHV: 3133

Truck %: 45

D (Directional Distribution) %: 53

Design Speed: 75 mi/h

Posted Speed: 70 mi/h

Required Minimum Widths

Lane Width: 12 ft

Shoulder Width: 12 RT / 8 LT ft

Bridge Curb-to-Curb: 56 ft

Design Exception Required? Yes No

If "Yes", explain.

Typology: Limited Access Freeway – Rural Interstate

Topography: Level Rolling Mountainous

Proposed Design Criteria: New and Reconstruction

Traffic Control Measures

The following traffic control measures will be implemented:

- Temporary Bridge(s)
- Temporary Roadway
- Detour
- Ramp Closure
- Other (specify)
- None

Other Description: Use of Crossovers

If any of the above traffic control measures will be implemented, indicate the following conditions.

Provisions for access by local traffic will be made and so posted.

True False

Through-traffic dependent business will not be adversely affected. True False

There will be no interference with any local special event or festival. True False

There will be no substantial environmental consequences associated with the traffic control measure(s). True False

There is no substantial controversy associated with the traffic control measure(s). True False

There are no substantial impacts to bicycle or pedestrian routes. True False

If the answer to any of the above questions was "False", please explain.

Detours should be clearly shown on the map and described, including provisions for pedestrians, bicycles, disabled and the elderly.

Approximate length of planned detour: 13.5 Detour Map

Make the selection that best describes the planned detour:

- Detour will use local roads with no improvements.
- Detour will involve improvements to local roads with no resulting impacts on safety or the environment.
- Detour will involve improvements to local roads and will impact safety and/or the environment.
- Detour will use only state owned roads.

Describe impacts

Detour is for SR 4005 and will only be short-term events as required for Structure removal and erection.

Estimated Costs

Engineering: \$ 2,121,800 **Right-of-Way:** \$ 265,226 **Construction:** \$ 95,000,000 **Utilities:** \$ 265,226

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

1. [Canoe Creek Detour Board_ver 9-3-19.pdf](#) (698KB / 0.7MB)

CE Evaluation Part A

Roadway

No roadways included with this project

Roadway Description

Interstate 80

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	2	2
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	8 RT / 4 LT ft	12 RT / 8 LT ft
Median Width:	varies ft	varies ft
Sidewalk Width:	0 ft	0 ft
Bicycle Lane Width:	0 ft	0 ft
Clear Zone Width:	32 ft	32 ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Proposed shoulder width 8 ft LT, 4 ft paved and 4ft graded.

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part A

Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: 16-0080-0550-0825

BRKEY: 10944

Description: (provide name of waterway or facility structure crosses)

Structure crosses SR 4005 (Tippecanoe Road) and Canoe Creek

	Existing	Proposed
Structure Type:	Girder-Floorbeam-Stringer	Multi-Girder
Weight Restrictions:	n/a ton	n/a ton
Height Restrictions:	n/a ft	n/a ft
Curb to Curb Width:	32 ft	56 ft
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	4 ft	24/8 ft
Sidewalk Width:	n/a ft	n/a ft
Total Bridge Width*:	36.5 ft	59.4 ft
	*Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present.	
Under Clearance:	100 ft	99.5 ft
Lateral Clearance:	52 ft	56.2 ft
Sufficiency Rating:	83.9	
Structure Length:	1156 ft	1160 ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part A

Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: 16-0080-0551-0910

BRKEY: 10945

Description: (provide name of waterway or facility structure crosses)

Structure crosses SR 4005 (Tippecanoe Road) and Canoe Creek

	Existing	Proposed
Structure Type:	Girder-Floorbeam-Stringer	Multi-Girder
Weight Restrictions:	n/a ton	n/a ton
Height Restrictions:	n/a ft	n/a ft
Curb to Curb Width:	32 ft	56 ft
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	4 ft	24/8 ft
Sidewalk Width:	n/a ft	n/a ft
Total Bridge Width*:	36.5 ft	59.4 ft
	*Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present.	
Under Clearance:	100 ft	98.4 ft
Lateral Clearance:	27 ft	55.6 ft
Sufficiency Rating:	55	
Structure Length:	1090 ft	1160 ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-1
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Aquatic Resources)

Federal Project Number: N/A

1. AQUATIC RESOURCES

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
STREAMS, RIVERS & WATERCOURSES¹	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	
Intermittent (streams only)	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes
Perennial	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes
Wild trout streams	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes
Stocked trout streams	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes

Identify all streams and their classifications per Chapter 93 of 25 PA Code (e.g. CWF, WWF, HQ, EV)

Field investigations conducted September 24 and 26, 2019 identified nineteen jurisdictional watercourses within the project study area. These streams included Canoe Creek and eighteen unnamed tributaries to Canoe Creek. The Pennsylvania Code Title 25, Chapter 93 Water Quality Standards, identifies the management designation for Canoe Creek is High Quality Cold Water Fishes (HQ-CWF). All unnamed tributaries to Canoe Creek will also carry the same management designation as Canoe Creek (HQ-CWF).

Linear feet of Streams permanently impacted: 405

Describe Any Permanent Impacts

Approximately 405 linear feet of permanent impacts to streams is anticipated including linear feet of bridge deck over Canoe Creek and UNT 5 (ephemeral stream). Of this total, approximately 60 linear feet of stream will require relocation due to cut/fill slopes and one small area for pier placement.

Describe Any Temporary Impacts

Approximately 2,840 linear feet of temporary impacts to streams is anticipated including work associated with the arch culvert carrying UNT 2 under I-80 and other drainage pipes carrying jurisdictional watercourses.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Project Specific Restoration/Enhancement: 60 *linear feet*

Advanced Compensation/Banking: *linear feet*

Other:

Mitigation Remarks

Stream mitigation and/or restoration plans will be included in the waterway permit application for the project. The details of mitigation will be determined through consultation with permitting agencies. Based on preliminary impact estimates, approximately 60 linear feet of

stream relocation is anticipated.

Canoe Creek is identified by the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission (PFBC) as both a "Stocked Trout Water" and a "Wild Trout Water" (naturally reproducing) within the project area. As a result, no work will be permitted in the stream from March 1st to June 15th (for stocked trout) and October 1st to December 31st (for wild trout).

Remarks

Canoe Creek is identified by the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission (PFBC) as both a "Stocked Trout Water" and a "Wild Trout Water" (naturally reproducing) within the project area. As a result, no work will be permitted in the stream from March 1st to June 15th (for stocked trout) and October 1st to December 31st (for wild trout).

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

FEDERAL WILD & SCENIC RIVERS & STREAMS¹

Not Present Present

No Yes

Remarks

Review of the USGS Quadrangle and Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers System website has confirmed there are no Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers and Streams within the project area.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

STATE SCENIC RIVERS & STREAMS¹

Not Present Present

No Yes

Remarks

Review of the USGS Quadrangle and DCNR Scenic Rivers website has confirmed there are no State Wild and Scenic Rivers and Streams within the project area.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS¹

Not Present Present

Coast Guard Navigable

Not Present Present

No Yes

PFBC Water Trail

Not Present Present

No Yes

Recreational Boating Waterway

Not Present Present

No Yes

Documentation³

- PFBC Aids to Navigation Plan
- Coast Guard Coordination

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

There will be no permanent impacts. If requested by PFBC, an ATON Plan would be prepared. Coordination with PFBC will be conducted as part of the waterway permitting process in Final Design.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

In Final Design as part of the waterway permitting process, PFBC will be consulted to determine if an ATON plan is required.

Remarks

Review of the PFBC website confirmed that there are no water trails located within the project study area. There are no navigable watercourses which require U.S. Coast Guard Coordination within the project area. American Whitewater Association website includes Canoe Creek, from I-80 to the Clarion River, in its stream inventory; however, no guage or flow range information is provided. This reach is described as, "... a very small steep creek draining into the Clarion River. It will take a significant amount of rain or snow melt to bring it up, but once up it is wild looking. One section drops 60 feet in a half mile, but be aware of low pipeline crossings and downed trees." Reach information was last updated in 2011. <https://www.americanwhitewater.org/content/River/detail/id/3851/> Based on normal flow depth, it is unlikely that the stream is canoeable. The reach above the I-80 bridges is not inventoried as recreational boating waters, and it is highly unlikely that boaters would be passing through the construction site from upstream. PFBC will be consulted as part of the pre-application process to determine if an ATON plan is required.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

OTHER SURFACE WATERS¹

Not Present Present

Remarks

Review of google earth aerial mapping and a field investigation conducted on February 28, 2018 confirmed that there are no other surface waters within the project area.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

GROUNDWATER RESOURCES¹

Not Present Present

State, County, Municipal or Local Public Supply Wells

Not Present Present

No Yes

Residential Well

Not Present Present

No Yes

Well Head Protection Area

Not Present Present

No Yes

Springs, Seeps

Not Present Present

No Yes

Potable Water Source

Not Present Present

No Yes

Sole Source and/or

Exceptional Value Aquifers

Not Present Present

No Yes

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

None anticipated

Is mitigation incorporated?

No Yes

Remarks

Review of the PaGWIS website has confirmed that three private residential wells are located within close proximity of the project area. All

three wells are located on the north side of Interstate 80. However, due to the project scope associated with the project, the residential wells are not expected to be impacted by the proposed project. The three wells are located at the following coordinates: (41.18361 -79.5275) (41.1975 -79.5014) (41.19 -79.5167)

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
WETLANDS¹	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	
Open Water	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Vegetated		
Emergent	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes
Scrub Shrub	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Forested	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Exceptional Value	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes

Documentation³

- Data Forms
- Wetland Identification and Delineation Report
- Conceptual Mitigation Plan
- 404 (b)(1) Alternative Analysis
- Jurisdictional Determination
- Functional Assessment Analysis

Methodology

Field investigations conducted September 24 and 26, 2019 identified and delineated fifteen wetlands within the project study area. All wetlands were classified as palustrine emergent (PEM) wetlands. Field investigations were conducted in accordance with the methodology described in the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE Corp of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual (Technical Report Y-81-1) and the USACE Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Eastern Mountains and Piedmont Region Version 2.0), Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP), Chapter 105 regulations, Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act, and the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) Publication No. 325.

Number of Wetlands permanently impacted: 5

Acreage of Wetlands permanently impacted: 0.13

Describe Any Permanent Impacts

Approximately 0.13 acre of permanent impacts to wetlands is anticipated including wetlands located at the upstream and downstream area of the arch culvert carrying UNT 2 under I-80., additional wetlands impacted by cut/fill, and small wetlands delineated in the median of I-80 that cannot be avoided by temporary crossovers.

Describe Any Temporary Impacts

The preliminary estimate of temporary impacts is 0.64 acres, including wetlands located at the upstream and downstream area of the arch culvert carrying UNT 2 under I-80 (area not permanently impacted but necessary for access to the culvert). Additional wetlands within the LOD that are not permanently impacted were included with temporary impact acreage.

Temporary impacted areas will be protected with geotextiles, aggregate and/or timber mats.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Project Specific Replacement/Construction: 0.13 acres

Banking: acres

Bank to be Debited:

Restoration: acres

Preservation: acres

In-Lieu Fee: whole dollars

Other:

Mitigation Remarks

A goal of final design will be to reduce permanent impacts to de minimis (equal to or less than 0.05 ac). If permanent impacts exceed 0.05 ac, mitigation will be provided. The details of wetland mitigation will be determined through consultation with permitting agencies. Wetlands within the project study area not impacted by the project will be delineated with protective orange construction fence.

Executive Order 11990 Compliance

Compliance requires the determination that there is no practicable alternative to the proposed construction in wetlands and the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands which may result from such use.

Options/design modifications were investigated to avoid impacts to wetlands: Yes No N/A

There are no practicable alternatives to construction within the wetlands: Yes No N/A

Alternative chosen (proposed project) includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands: Yes No N/A

If the answer to any of the above three questions is No, provide an explanation in the Remarks Section below.

Remarks

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

COASTAL ZONE¹

Not Present Present

No Yes

Remarks

There are no coastal zones located within the project area.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

FLOODPLAINS¹

Not Present Present

No Yes

No significant floodplain encroachment would occur.

If, after consultation with FHWA, it is concluded that there will be significant floodplain encroachment, a floodplain finding is required, and an EIS or EA will need to be prepared because a CEE is not an appropriate level of NEPA documentation. Significant floodplain encroachment is defined in DM-1B.

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Remarks

Review of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for the project determined that a FEMA 100-year floodplain (Zone A) has been established for Canoe Creek and an unnamed tributary to Canoe Creek within the project area. The project will have no significant floodplain encroachment, as defined in 23 CFR Part 650, Subpart A, Section 650.105(q), since the project will not: 1. Have a significant potential for interruption or termination of a transportation facility which is needed for emergency vehicles or provides a community's only evacuation route, 2. Have a significant risk, 3. Have a significant adverse impact on natural and beneficial flood plain values.

SOIL EROSION & SEDIMENTATION¹

Are there activities that could cause erosion or sedimentation and would require E&S Controls? Yes No N/A

Documentation³

- Coordination w/County Conservation District
- E&S Control Plan
- NPDES Stormwater Construction Permit

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Remarks

A NPDES permit will be developed and submitted to the Clarion County Conservation District (CCCD) for review and approval. An Erosion and Sedimentation (E&S) Control Plan and Post Construction Stormwater Management (PCSM) Plan will be developed and will be incorporated into the construction contract.

- 1 If the resource is not present, do not complete the remainder of this subject area.**
- 2 If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, describe in Remarks why there will be no impact. If there will be no impact because avoidance/mitigation measures will be included, describe those in the mitigation text box provided.**
- 3 Unless required as an attachment, documentation for subject areas should be maintained in the project's Technical Support Data and does not need to be submitted with the CEE.**

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-2
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Land)

2. LAND

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES¹	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	
Productive Agricultural Land	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Agricultural Security Areas	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Prime Agricultural Land	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Agricultural Conservation Easements	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Farmland Enrolled in Preferential Tax Assessments	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Agricultural Zoning	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Soil Capability Classes I, II, III, IV	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Prime or Unique Soil	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Statewide or Locally Important Soils	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

Documentation³

- Farmland Assessment Report
- ALCAB Approval
- Agricultural Land Preservation Policy Conformance Statement
- Form AD-1006 - Farmland Conversion Impact Rating or Form NRCS-CPA-106 for Corridor Type Projects
- Coordination with County Tax Assessor

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

None anticipated

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Remarks

Examination of USDA NRCS web soil survey mapping for the project area identified four (4) Prime Farmland soil types and eight Farmland of Statewide Importance soil types within the project study area. These soil classifications are protected under the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA). However, bridge replacements on alignment are exempt from FPPA provisions as per Farmland Protection Policy Manual, 523.11, C. Activities Not Subject to Provisions of FPPA, (10) Restoration, maintenance, renovation or replacement of existing structures prior to the time of Federal Assistance.

Site visits have confirmed that no active agricultural land is present within the project study area; therefore, there will be no impact to ALPP Prime Agricultural Land. This project is in conformance with 4 Pa Code Chapter 7, Section 7.301 et seq., ALPP. Additionally, this project is an upgrade of existing transportation facility and is exempt from Acts 43 and 100 per the Pennsylvania Agricultural Resources Handbook, Publication 324, Table 2.

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
VEGETATION¹	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	

Landscaped	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Agricultural	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Forest Land	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Rangeland	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Other (describe in remarks)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Vegetation within the project corridor primarily consists of herbaceous rangeland, deciduous forest land and roadside vegetation along Interstate 80. Permanent and Temporary impacts will occur to the project corridor vegetation to construct project improvements. This includes roadside vegetation as well as land below and adjacent to the I-80 bridges for crane placement and other construction vehicle access.

Invasive Non-Native Plants are Present

Mitigation:

Are measures being taken to minimize movement of invasive plant parts (roots, tubers, seeds)? Yes No

Will native plants be used in project landscaping or mitigation? Yes No **If Yes, explain in Describe Mitigation.**

Other? Yes No **If Yes, explain in Describe Mitigation.**

Describe Mitigation

Re-vegetation of impacted areas will be implemented through the E&S plan. Prior to completion of construction, all remaining areas of earth disturbance will be restored by re-seeding with standard PennDOT seed formulas. These seed formulas may contain native plant species; but per Executive Order 13112, will avoid those plant species that are listed on the Noxious Weed Control List.

Remarks

Herbaceous rangeland, deciduous forest land and roadside vegetation are present along the project corridor. Invasive species were noted during field delineation of wetlands and streams. The following invasive species were observed: Multiflora Rose (*Rosa multiflora*), Autumn Olive (*Elaeagnus umbellata*), Canada Thistle (*Cirsium arvense*), Reed Canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), and Common reed (*Phragmites australis*).

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

GEOLOGIC RESOURCES¹

Not Present Present

Remarks

According to the DCNR Heritage Geology Sites website, there are no Heritage Geology Sites in the project area. Additionally, the project area is not located near an Outstanding Scenic Geological Feature according to review of the Outstanding Scenic Geological Features of Pennsylvania Part 2.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

PARKS & RECREATION FACILITIES¹

Not Present Present

Remarks

There are no properties afforded protection under one or more federal and/or state recreation grants within the project area.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

FOREST & GAMELANDS¹

Not Present Present

Remarks

A review of Google Maps, the PA Gazateer (DeLorme 2012), aerial imagery, PennDOT One Map (formerly MPMS IQ), and the results of the field reconnaissance did not identify any State Forests or State Gamelands within the PSA.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

WILDERNESS, NATURAL & WILD AREAS¹

Not Present Present

Remarks

Review of USGS mapping, PADEP eMap, and site investigations confirmed there are no Federal and/or State Wilderness, Natural or Wild Areas within the project area.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

NATIONAL NATURAL LANDMARKS¹

Not Present Present

No Yes

Remarks

There are no national natural landmarks present within the project area.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

HAZARDOUS OR RESIDUAL WASTE SITES¹

Not Present Present

No Yes

Documentation³

- Phase I
- Phase II
- Phase III
- Other
- No Documentation Required

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

None anticipated

Is remediation/mitigation incorporated? No Yes Unknown at this time

Remarks

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted in accordance with PennDOT Publication 281, "Waste Site Evaluation Procedures for the Highway Development Process" to determine if hazardous, residual, or municipal waste sites exist within the study area. Three potential Areas of Concern (AOC) that were identified in the Alternatives Analysis phase of the project were investigated. The Phase I ESA included site reconnaissance on September 27, 2019, environmental database review, historical data review, and personal interviews. The Phase I ESA findings and conclusions resulted in recommendations of no further action is required at this time.

RECOMMENDATION 1: AOC-1 (north of I-80 WB between STA 239+00 and STA 242+00)

The site conditions at the two private properties located within the AOC indicate a significant likelihood of contamination exists outside the proposed ROW that may impact soil or groundwater within the ROW. However, no excavations are planned for the area and application of fill will be limited to the ROW. Therefore, no further action is required at this time. However, if future design includes excavations within the ROW, a Phase II will be required to investigate any impacts from the adjacent properties prior to construction activities.

RECOMMENDATION 2: AOC-2 (Canoe Creek valley under I-80 EB bridge between STA 287+00 and STA 289+00)

No indications of contamination were present within the AOC that would necessitate any further investigation. Therefore, no further action is required.

RECOMMENDATION 3: AOC-3 (north of I-80 WB between STA 309+00 and STA 310+50)

The orange-stained water within the perennial stream is indicative of acid mine drainage. As required in Section 6.0 of Pub. 281, the district environmental manager should notify the district geotechnical manager of the field observations. Other than the orange-stained water within the stream, there are no indications of contamination within the ROW. Therefore, no further action is required at this time.

-
- 1 If the resource is not present, do not complete the remainder of this subject area.**
 - 2 If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, describe in Remarks why there will be no impact. If there will be no impact because avoidance/mitigation measures will be included, describe those in the mitigation text box provided.**
 - 3 Unless required as an attachment, documentation for subject areas should be maintained in the project's Technical Support Data and does not need to be submitted with the CEE.**
-

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-3
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Wildlife)

3. WILDLIFE

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
WILDLIFE & HABITAT¹	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	
Remarks		
<p>The results of the field reconnaissance and review of the Pennsylvania Gazetteer (DeLorme 2015), US Fish and Wildlife Service and Nature Conservancy Map Portals did not identify any wildlife sanctuaries, wildlife refuges, unique or critical habitat, or wildlife preserves in the vicinity of the PSA.</p> <p>http://www.fws.gov/refuges/refugeLocatorMaps/Pennsylvania.html http://www.nature.org/about-us/visit-preserve-map/index.htm</p>		

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
THREATENED & ENDANGERED PLANTS & ANIMALS¹	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present <input type="radio"/> No Coordination Needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Potential Impacts <input type="checkbox"/> Potential Impacts with Avoidance Measures <input type="checkbox"/> Potential Impacts with Conservation Measures <input type="checkbox"/> Potential Impacts

Reviews, concurrences and approvals for Threatened and Endangered Species searches/coordination are time sensitive. If the coordination is greater than two years old, a new coordination effort will be required with the commenting/review agency(s).

Documentation

PNDI ER Receipt

Agency Documentation

PFBC Correspondence

PGC Correspondence

DCNR Correspondence

USFWS Correspondence

Remarks

The Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory (PNDI) review of October 17, 2019 determined that there are no known impacts anticipated to threatened and endangered species and/or special concern species and resources within the project area. No further review is required at this time. The PNDI receipt is valid for two years.

-
- 1 If the resource is not present, do not complete the remainder of this subject area.**
 - 2 If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, describe in Remarks why there will be no impact. If there will be no impact because avoidance/mitigation measures will be included, describe those in the mitigation text box provided.**
 - 3 Unless required as an attachment, documentation for subject areas should be maintained in the project's Technical Support Data and does not need to be submitted with the CEE.**

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

1. [project_receipt_i_80_canoe_creek_bridges_696123_FINAL_1.pdf](#) (980KB / 1MB)

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-4
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Cultural Resources)

4. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Were Cultural Resource Professionals (CRPs) needed for project scoping? Yes No

CRP Scoping Field View Date: 07/26/17

CRP Architectural Historian in Attendance: CRP Architectural Historian was not present at scoping field view.

CRP Archaeologist in Attendance: Susanne Haney

Was a Project Early Notification / Scoping Results Form completed? Yes No

For projects exempted from further Section 106 review under Appendix C of the Statewide Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, determine whether eligible resources are present for application of Section 4(f).

Is the project exempted from review by the District Designee or CRP as per Appendix C of the Statewide Section 106 Programmatic Agreement? Yes No

Is the project exempted from review by the District Designee or CRP as per Stipulation III of the Emergency Relief Projects Programmatic Agreement (2005)? Yes No

	<u>PRESENCE</u>				<u>LEVEL OF EFFECTS</u>		
	Not Present	Potentially Eligible Resource Present	Eligible Resource Present	Listed Resource Present	No Historic Properties Affected	No Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect
CULTURAL RESOURCES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<u>Archaeology</u>							
Pre-Contact:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Contact Native American:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Historic:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<u>Above-Ground Historic Properties</u>							
Structure/Building:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
District:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			

Documentation

Conclusion of Section 106 consultation must be documented in the following ways:

For projects *having an adverse effect*, one of the following:

- Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)
- Letter of Agreement (LOA)

- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
- Letter of Understanding (LOU)
- Specific Programmatic Agreement (PA)
- Standard Treatment
- Deferral of Archaeological Testing

For projects ***not having a known adverse effect***, one from ***each*** column:

Above-Ground Historic Properties

- Above-Ground Historic Properties Field Assessment and Finding
- Above-Ground Historic Properties Finding Letter
- Section 106 (Above-Ground Historic Properties) Effect Concurrence Letter
- TE Project Field Assessment and Finding Checklist

Archaeology

- Archaeology Field Assessment and Finding
- Archaeology Finding Letter
- Section 106 (Archaeology) Effect Concurrence Letter
- TE Project Field Assessment and Finding Checklist
- Deferred Archaeological Testing Form
- Project Specific Programmatic Agreement

Supplemental documentation should be completed as warranted:

- Historic Structures Survey / Determination of Eligibility Report
- Phase Ia Archaeological Sensitivity Report
- Geomorphological Survey Report
- Archaeological Disturbance Report
- Archaeology Identification (Phase I) Report
- Archaeology Negative Survey Form
- Archaeology Evaluation (Phase II) Report
- Combined Archaeology Identification/Evaluation Report
- Determination of Effects Report
- (Bridge) Feasibility Report
- Other **(describe in remarks)**

Include Section 106 Public Involvement in Part B, Section C, Public Involvement.

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Are mitigation and/or standard treatments required? No Yes

Describe Mitigation / Standard Treatments

One previous recorded historic industrial site, 36CL0198 Tippecanoe Furnace was re-located via pedestrian survey. The 36CL0198 Tippecanoe Furnace site is located almost entirely within existing PennDOT right of way; however, during construction the furnace remains will be fenced off and avoided. Any intact soils at the site or in the immediate vicinity will either be fenced off and avoided or protected using geotextile and the appropriate amount of fill.

Of the areas with intact soils, there are two areas, designated Area A and Area B, that are going to be impacted and were deemed to contain intact soils with archaeological potential. A Phase I survey consisting of sub-surface excavation was conducted within these areas. One previously unrecorded site with pre-contact and historic components, 36CL0211 Edenburg Well site identified. However, the portion of the site within the APE does not contribute to the site's overall eligibility. During construction, in order to prevent inadvertent disturbance, the portion of the site beyond the APE will be fenced off and avoided.

Remarks

One previous recorded historic industrial site, 36CL0198 Tippecanoe Furnace was re-located via pedestrian survey. The 36CL0198

Tippecanoe Furnace site is located almost entirely within existing PennDOT right of way; however, during construction the furnace remains will be fenced off and avoided. Any intact soils at the site or in the immediate vicinity will either be fenced off and avoided or protected using geotextile and the appropriate amount of fill.

Of the areas with intact soils, there are two areas, designated Area A and Area B, that are going to be impacted and were deemed to contain intact soils with archaeological potential. A Phase I survey consisting of sub-surface excavation was conducted within these areas. One previously unrecorded site with pre-contact and historic components, 36CL0211 Edenburg Well site identified. However, the portion of the site within the APE does not contribute to the site's overall eligibility. During construction, in order to prevent inadvertent disturbance, the portion of the site beyond the APE will be fenced off and avoided.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Section 106 cultural resource documentation is located in Project Path. Combined findings was posted on 4/10/2020.

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-5
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Section 4(f) Resources)

5. SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES

PRESENCE

USE¹

SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES

Not Present Present

No Yes

Remarks

Review of on-line resources (PADEP's EMapPA website, PADCNr website, PGC website) and field investigations conducted on February 28, 2018 confirmed there are no resources protected under Section 4(f)/Section 2002 within the project area.

- 1 If the resource is present but no use is anticipated, describe in Remarks why there will be no use. If there will be no use because avoidance/mitigation measures will be included, describe those in the mitigation text box provided.**
 - 2 Unless required as an attachment, documentation for subject areas should be maintained in the project's Technical Support Data and does not need to be submitted with the CEE.**
-

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

6. AIR QUALITY AND NOISE

AIR QUALITY

Is the project exempt from regional ozone conformity analysis and a CO, PM10 & PM2.5 Hot-Spot analysis? Yes No

See exempt project list in Air Quality Handbook, Pub #321.

If Yes, the system skips the next few questions.

Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)

Is the project exempt from an analysis for MSATs based on Pub #321? Yes No

See Air Quality Handbook, Pub #321, for exemptions.

If Yes, the system skips the remainder of this section.

Air Quality Remarks

The project is a bridge replacement with safety improvements including bridge and shoulder widening. The project will not add travel lanes and will not result in changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, location of existing facility or other factor that would cause an increase in emissions relative to existing conditions.

NOISE

1. Is the project a:

Reference PennDOT Pub #24 for additional information on Type I, II and III Projects.

A. Type I Project? Yes No

B. Type II Project? Yes No

C. Type III Project? **If Yes, the system skips questions 2 and 3.** Yes No

- The project meets the criteria for a Type III project established in 23 CFR 772. Therefore, the project requires no analysis for highway traffic noise impacts. Type III projects do not involve added capacity, construction of new through lanes or auxiliary lanes, changes in the horizontal or vertical alignment of the roadway or exposure of noise sensitive land uses to a new or existing highway noise source. PennDOT acknowledges that a noise analysis is required if changes to the proposed project result in reclassification to a Type I project.

Noise Remarks

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-7
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Socioeconomic Areas)

Where mitigation is incorporated for socioeconomic impacts, add the mitigation commitments to form B: E.

REGIONAL & COMMUNITY GROWTH

Will the project induce impacts (positive and negative) on planned growth, land use, or development patterns for the area? Yes No

Is the project consistent with planned growth? Yes No

Basis of this determination:

The project is listed on the FFY 2019 and 2021 Interstate TIP

Will the project induce secondary growth? Yes No

PUBLIC FACILITIES & SERVICES

Will the project induce negative impacts on health and educational facilities; public utilities; fire, police and emergency services; civil defense; religious institutions; or public transportation? Yes No

Does the project incorporate bicycle or pedestrian facilities into the overall design or operations (including construction)? Yes No

Explain. (Complete a bicycle/pedestrian checklist if applicable for this project.)

A review of the PA Gazetteer (DeLorme 2015), aerial imagery, PennDOT OneMap, and the results of the field reconnaissance did not identify any bicycle or pedestrian facilities within or adjacent to the Project Study Area.

Will the project have a positive impact to the public facilities and services listed above? Yes No

If Yes, explain.

The proposed bridge replacement project will maintain a reliable crossing over SR 4005 and Canoe Creek, while also widening bridge curb-to-curb width and roadway shoulders, having a positive impact to public facilities and services..

COMMUNITY COHESION

Will the project induce impacts to community cohesion? Yes No

Will the project induce impacts to the local tax base or property values?

Yes No

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Is the project exempt from Detailed Project Level Environmental Justice Analysis per Section 2.1 of Publication 746, Project Level Environmental Justice Guidance?

Yes No

Is an Environmental Justice population, as identified in Executive Order 12898, present? ¹

Yes No

No known minority or low-income populations have been identified that would be disproportionately highly and adversely affected by this project as determined above. Therefore, this project has met the provisions of Executive Order 12898.

RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITIONS OR DISPLACEMENTS OF PEOPLE, BUSINESSES OR FARMS

How many parcels require right-of-way acquisition, either partial or total?

Up to nine (9) parcels require ROW acquisition

Describe the extent and locations of acquisitions. Indicate for each acquisition whether it is temporary or permanent.

Any ROW acquisition is expected to be sliver takes or for purposes of TCE.

Will the project require the relocation of people, businesses or farms?

Yes No

Will the project induce impacts to economic activity, including employment gains and losses?

Yes No

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATING COSTS OF THE PROJECT AND RELATED FACILITIES

Will the project induce increases of operating or maintenance costs?

Yes No

PUBLIC CONTROVERSY ON ENVIRONMENTAL GROUNDS

Will the project involve substantial controversy concerning social, cultural, or natural resource impacts?

Yes No

AESTHETIC AND OTHER VALUES

Will the project be visually intrusive to the surrounding environment? Yes No

Will the project include "multiple use" opportunities? ² Yes No

Will the project involve "joint development" activities? ³ Yes No

- 1 Copies of pertinent EJ information, data, analyses, and outreach activities should be placed in the project's Technical Support Data files.

 - 2 Examples of "multiple use" may include historical monuments, parking areas, bikeways, pedestrian paths, and other shared-use facilities on highway right-of-way.

 - 3 "Joint development" involves compatible development in conjunction with the highway. Examples could include construction of highway facilities such as highways, turning lanes, interchanges, or lane widening in conjunction with planned residential, shopping, commercial, or industrial facilities.
-

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section B
Consistency Determinations

If the project is not consistent with established guidelines or will be made consistent through agreed upon mitigation, describe mitigation measures.

- DEP Coastal Zone Management Plan:** Not Applicable Consistent Not Consistent
- DCNR/NPS Wild and Scenic River Management Plan:** Not Applicable Consistent Not Consistent
- FEMA Flood Map:** Not Applicable Consistent Not Consistent
- Other (describe in Remarks):** Not Applicable Consistent Not Consistent

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section C

Public Involvement

Document all public involvement efforts, including but not limited to, meetings, intent to enter letters, and displays. Indicate number of events when applicable. Include in the project technical file: notification of public involvement activities, and the resolution to relevant issues or concerns raised during public involvement.

	#	Comments
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plans Display	1	See Remarks
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Officials Meetings	1	See Remarks
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Meetings	1	See Remarks
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing		
<input type="checkbox"/> Special Purpose Meetings (specify)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Section 106 Public Involvement / Consulting Parties (specify)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Section 106 Tribal Consultation (specify Tribe(s) contacted and Tribal response)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Justice Community Involvement (if applicable)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other information dissemination activities (specify)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Commitment for Further Public Involvement		

Remarks

A Public Officials /Public Plans Display meeting was held September 5, 2019 at the Knox Volunteer Fire Company, Knox, PA. The Public Officials Meeting was held from 4:00-5:00 PM, followed by the general public meeting from 5:30-7:30 PM. Public involvement documentation is located in the project's technical file. There were no outstanding controversies over the proposed project.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section D
Permits Checklist

Check all permits required for permanent and temporary actions.

No Permits Required

United States Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 and/or Section 10 Permit

Individual Nationwide PASPGP

DEP Waterway Encroachment (105) Permit

Standard Small Project General Other

DEP 401 Water Quality Certification

Coast Guard Permit

NPDES Permit

General Individual Exempt

Other Permits

Other Permits Information

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section E
Resources To Be Avoided and Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures summarized in this section should be incorporated into the project's design documents. In order to track and transfer mitigation commitments through the project development process, **Environmental Commitments & Mitigation Tracking System (ECMTS)** documentation should be prepared and submitted to the appropriate channels, including the Contract Management Unit, as the project moves through Final Design and Construction. Mitigation is automatically completed for the resource specific areas in this document. Non-resourced specific mitigation should be added to this page for documentation purposes.

Mitigation measures are **COMMITMENTS** of both the Department and FHWA and are agreed to and approved by the District Executive for Level 1 CEEs and by the Division Administrator of FHWA for Level 2 CEEs.

Impacts and mitigation commitments are based on Preliminary Design and may change as the project moves through Final Design and Construction. Final design information and final mitigation commitments are included in the ECMTS documentation.

1. Specific Permanent Impacts

Streams (B:A-1): 405 *linear feet*

Wetlands (B:A-1): 0.13 *acres*

State Gamelands (B:A-2): *acres*

2. Specific Mitigation Commitments

STREAMS (B:A-1)

Project Specific Restoration/Enhancement: 60 *linear feet*

Advanced Compensation/Banking: *linear feet*

Other:

Mitigation Remarks: Stream mitigation and/or restoration plans will be included in the waterway permit application for the project. The details of mitigation will be determined through consultation with permitting agencies. Based on preliminary impact estimates, approximately 60 linear feet of stream relocation is anticipated. Canoe Creek is identified by the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission (PFBC) as both a "Stocked Trout Water" and a "Wild Trout Water" (naturally reproducing) within the project area. As a result, no work will be permitted in the stream from March 1st to June 15th (for stocked trout) and October 1st to December 31st (for wild trout).

WETLANDS (B:A-1)

Project Specific Replacement/Construction: 0.13 *acres*

Banking: *acres*

Bank to be Debited:

Restoration: *acres*

Preservation: *acres*

In-Lieu Fee: *whole dollars*

Other:

Mitigation Remarks: A goal of final design will be to reduce permanent impacts to de minimis (equal to or less than 0.05 ac). If permanent impacts exceed 0.05 ac, mitigation will be provided.

The details of wetland mitigation will be determined through consultation with permitting agencies.

Wetlands within the project study area not impacted by the project will be delineated with protective orange construction fence.

STATE GAMELANDS (B:A-2)

Project Specific Replacement: *acres*

Banking: *acres*

Bank to be Debited:

Other:

Mitigation Remarks:

COMMITMENTS FOR FURTHER PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT (B:C)

3. Other Mitigation Commitments

RESOURCE SPECIFIC

Navigable Waterways (B:A-1)

In Final Design as part of the waterway permitting process, PFBC will be consulted to determine if an ATON plan is required.

Vegetation (B:A-2)

Re-vegetation of impacted areas will be implemented through the E&S plan. Prior to completion of construction, all remaining areas of earth disturbance will be restored by re-seeding with standard PennDOT seed formulas. These seed formulas may contain native plant species; but per Executive Order 13112, will avoid those plant species that are listed on the Noxious Weed Control List.

Cultural Resources (B:A-4)

One previous recorded historic industrial site, 36CL0198 Tippecanoe Furnace was re-located via pedestrian survey. The 36CL0198 Tippecanoe Furnace site is located almost entirely within existing PennDOT right of way; however, during construction the furnace remains will be fenced off and avoided. Any intact soils at the site or in the immediate vicinity will either be fenced off and avoided or protected using geotextile and the appropriate amount of fill.

Of the areas with intact soils, there are two areas, designated Area A and Area B, that are going to be impacted and were deemed to contain intact soils with archaeological potential. A Phase I survey consisting of sub-surface excavation was conducted within these areas. One previously unrecorded site with pre-contact and historic components, 36CL0211 Edenburg Well site identified. However, the portion of the site within the APE does not contribute to the site's overall eligibility. During construction, in order to prevent inadvertent disturbance, the portion of the site beyond the APE will be fenced off and avoided.

NON-RESOURCE SPECIFIC

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section F

Scoping Field View

Date of Scoping Field View: 07/26/17

Attendee List (Name, Organization)

John McCombie PENNDOT District 10 – Project Manager;
Jason Layman PENNDOT District 10 – Assistant Project Manager;
John Buck Federal Highway Administration;
Ezequiel Lujan Federal Highway Administration;
Jon Crum Federal Highway Administration;
Sarah Cordek PENNDOT Central Office;
Susanne Haney PENNDOT District 10 – Cultural Resource Professional;
Jessica Rizzilli PENNDOT District 10 - Environmental Manager;
Tasha Hammer PENNDOT District 10 – Utilities;
Timothy Panzigrau PENNDOT District 10 – Geotechnical;
Sam Shaffer PENNDOT District 10 – Construction;
Vern Slaughenhoup PENNDOT District 10 - Assistant Maintenance Manager;
Ken Campbell PENNDOT District 10;
Matt Mucha PENNDOT District 10;
Brent Barron PENNDOT District 10;
Bob Schmidt HDR Engineering – Consultant Project Manager;
Dan Giles HDR Engineering – Roadway Engineer / Lead;
Judy Iszauk HDR Engineering – Traffic Engineer / Lead;

Anticipated NEPA Documentation

As supported by the information available at the time of scoping, this project appears to qualify for a Level 1b Categorical Exclusion in accordance with 23 CFR Part 771.117(d), Item Number 13.

Remarks Provide a brief description of NEPA documentation requirements agreed to at the field view.

Overview

Project Manager provided a brief overview of the project site, initiatives and goals of the design project.

The project will consist of preliminary engineering, final design and construction services for the replacement of the I-80 Canoe Creek Bridges EB & WB (SR 80 Sect 365) in Beaver Township, Clarion County over SR 4005 (Tippecanoe Rd) and Canoe Creek. During the replacement of the bridges, two lanes of traffic Eastbound and Westbound must be maintained at all times. The anticipated limits of project is approximately three miles along Interstate 80 bound between the Knox interchange and the weigh stations (MM 53.5 to MM 56.5) featuring the two large parallel structures (~1,100' each) that carry the interstate over Canoe Creek and Tippecanoe Road (SR 4005).

The general site geography is forested rural woodlands with rolling hills. The bridge structures are located along a long tangent bound by reverse horizontal curves. Vertically, the eastbound and westbound alignments are variably vertically bifurcated with elevation differences in excess of 20 feet. These curvatures and grades will provide significant design challenges with respect to balancing cuts and fills and resolution of vertical and horizontal geometry within design criteria for both final design and traffic control. There is a documented cultural resource related to the Tippecanoe Furnace site along the northwest corner of the westbound structure which requires avoidance of impact.

Anticipated design services will include, but are not limited to: field surveys, alternative alignment development, public involvement, preliminary drainage design, storm water design, cross sections, line and grade, design field view, preliminary geotechnical report, structure borings, preliminary Right-of-Way activities, hydrologic and hydraulic studies, preliminary TS&L, waterway permits, utility coordination, maintenance and protection of traffic, hazardous and residual wastes, archeology, and environmental clearance.

John explained that during the technical phase of the project; HDR had conceptually evaluated five (5) alternatives. John and Bob Schmidt then provided a brief overview of each conceptual alternate and described the general alignments providing key configurations of associated structures and roadways. The group collectively discussed the apparent advantages and disadvantages of each alternative as presented at the technical phase.

The attendees moved as a group to different points of interest along the project limit to field view and discuss known and observable features related to the structures, cut slopes, fill slopes, environmental and cultural resources.

Field View and Discussion Yielded Key Observations and Preferences

- Use 75 MPH Design Criteria – No substandard curves or design exceptions.

- ADT is approximately 25,000

- ITS devices are located within the corridor

- Anticipated that TCE's will be required with no revisions to the Right-of-Way

- There are only a few utilities in the corridor

- District scope requires maintenance of two lanes of traffic during construction except restrictions for short-term construction activities (i.e. Construction of Tie-ins, Demolition, Erection, etc...).

- Use of cross overs versus immediately adjacent construction appeared to be preferred by FHWA, Central Office and the District Representatives to aid in constructability and safety.
 - Alternatives evaluation will need to evaluate multiple forms of traffic control that best suit construction of alternate alignments investigated.

- Provide two independent structures for system redundancy – Single structure not desired.

- No longitudinal joints on structure – No phased construction of final bridge widths.

 - Steel Multi-girder seemed to be the initial reaction by FHWA, Central Office and District Representatives during SFV.
 - Alternatives evaluation will need to evaluate multiple structure types; i.e. Steel Multi-Girder, P/S concrete and Steel Delta.

 - Superstructure framing arrangement must provide future redecking which maintain two lanes of traffic on structure while redecking in only two phases.

 - Provide redecking lane widths to accommodate larger, wider permit vehicles which frequent this stretch of Interstate 80.

 - Avoid alternates which require impacts to the documented Tippecanoe Furnace site. If the site is avoided, and if there will be no more than 3.6 m (12 ft) of required right of way and any TCEs have been determined to be disturbed by the District Archaeologist, the project will be processed as B-List Exempt. If there will be more than 3.6 m (12 ft) or required right of way and/or large TCEs, or if there are TCEs where soils can be protected using geotextile and fill, the project will be Non-Exempt. Once a preferred alternative has been chosen and a footprint provided, the District Archaeologist may need to conduct a supplemental field view prior to providing additional archaeology recommendations. If there will be more than 3.6 m (12 ft) of required right of way, it is anticipated that a Phase I survey will be necessary. There are no historic structures concerns.

 - Minimize impacts to wetlands.

 - Provide PCSM features which consider the high-quality Canoe Creek.

 - CE Level 1B is anticipated for this project

 - Canoe Creek is considered a Wild trout stream – NPDES permit will be required

 - Central Office designation - Moderate Complexity project

 - This project will have FHWA oversight with FHWA review of the Alternatives Analysis and TS&L

 - There are four manufacturers of wide loads (such as modular homes) in the area that use I-80
-

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part C
CEE Approval Processing

Section B - Level 1b CEE Approval

As supported by the attached Categorical Exclusion Evaluation, this project qualifies for a Level 1b Categorical Exclusion in accordance with 23 CFR 771.117(d), Item Number 13.

County: Clarion **SR/Sec:** 0080/365 **MPMS:** 90021 **Project:** I-80 Canoe Creek Bridges

Prepared By: Jessica L Rizzilli
Title: District Environmental Manager **Date:** 04/17/20

Approved By: Brian N Allen **Date:** 04/20/20
Title: District Executive

The following individuals concurred with the statement above.

District Environmental Manager: Jessica L Rizzilli **Date:** 04/17/20

Assistant District Executive for Design: Tim J Jablunovsky **Date:** 04/20/20

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments